DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 602 HE 000 925

By-Cross, K. Patricia

The Campus Confrontations.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date 69
Note-8p.; Article from The Research Reporter, University of California, Berkeley, July 5, 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
Descriptors-*Activism, *Administrator Characteristics, *Educational Objectives, Higher Education, Social Change, *Student Reaction, *Teacher Attitudes

US campuses today are reflecting the changes that are taking place in the larger society, and are replete with groups of students, faculties, and administrators who espouse differing opinions. Rapid change is usually accompanied by conflict, but a majority of educators are baffled by the turmoil at leading colleges and universities. Studies on student groups revealed that those who are opposed to the demonstrations of their activist peers and others who are neutral expressed desires similar to the militant students on matters such as greater student involvement in academic affairs and other educational policies that affect them directly. In other studies, faculty members under 30 years of age and another group who were 55 years of age or older differed widely on crucial policy matters but tended to have similar permissive attitudes toward student unrest and other controversial incidents on campus. It was found that administrators differed among themselves on the principles and procedures of education but widely accepted the occasional need for the display of student power in order to bring about changes within the university. The broader academic community has not paid sufficient attention to institutional goals, and has failed to chart the purposes and directions of higher education. It is time for faculty, students, and administrators to unite in effective action for achieving peaceful educational reform. (WM)

ED029602

THE CAMPUS CONFRONTATIONS

by

K. PATRICIA CROSS

The Research Reporter
The Center for Research and Development
In Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 925

The Research Reporter

Volume IV, Number 1, 1969

THE CAMPUS CONFRONTATIONS

What has been gingerly referred to as student unrest is turning, on many campuses, into open warfare involving not only students but faculty, trustees, and state legislatures. The ivory tower seems to be tumbling down as an eager press and television pursue the theme that the community of scholars is becoming an army of combatants.

College confrontations emphasize the changes that are taking place throughout the larger society. Institutions of all varieties —the family, the church, the college—are under attack, and the tradition and authority which have been the hallmarks of society's institutions are becoming question marks in a new era. Few need the reminder of the popular song, "The times they are a-changin'." But we occasionally do need to be reminded that it is not always possible to bring about orderly change and that periods of rapid change almost always bring with them tension and conflict. For every radical student member of SDS and impatient AFT member, there are many students and faculty members who object to the change. Some like things the way they are, some accept the new goals but not the means, and still others reject both the means and the goals. It is small wonder that those agreeing on means and ends are such a vigorous minority.

While educators may understand that rapid change is generally accompanied by conflict, almost all are baffled and distraught by the campus confrontations that are overwhelming the educational process at leading institutions throughout the country and the world. To date, neither wise men nor research scholars have had the answers. Only those farthest from the situation think they know what to do about it. Advocates of either "get tough" or "give 'em what they want" policies are guilty of drastic oversimplification of enormously complex situations. Algo Henderson, one of the Center's researchers and a man who has served as a college president, a state associate commissioner of higher education, and a professor and research director in higher education has identified some of the factors at work at San Francisco State College, the scene of one of the longest-lasting confrontations.

The large number of groups and individuals involved in the power struggle at San Francisco State College constitutes one of its major problems. Exercising some form of legal control over some aspect of advocated changes are: the Coordinating Council for Higher Education which administers the California Master Plan for Higher Education, the Board of Trustees of the State College System, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Department of Finance, and the Chancellor of the State Colleges. The Governor and the Speaker of the Assembly are ex-officio members of the Board of Trustees, and are men with political power and influence and little hesitancy about expressing their ideas on what should be done. Among those from off-campus who have intervened in the student strike are the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), various labor unions in the San Francisco Bay area, the Association of California State College Professors, and civic and political leaders from the black community in San Francisco. On campus, there are the Third World Liberation Front, the Black Students Union, and the Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action. Although their exact role is difficult to document, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Black Panthers have been mentioned frequently in the press. The Mayor, the police force of San Francisco, and a Citizens' Committee of 21 have played a role, as have union mediators from outside the city. It is no wonder that when Dr. Robert Smith resigned as president of the college, he cited an "inability to reconcile effectively the conflicts between the trustees and the chancellor, the faculty groups on campus, the militant student groups, and political forces in the state."*

Needless to say, neither the Center nor any other professional group concerned with higher education has come up with a model for peaceful change that could be offered to San Francisco State and other campuses facing similarly complex problems. Nevertheless, it is fair to ask researchers studying higher education for information that may shed some light and understanding on the present turmoil, and the following informa-

*Quoted in *The College and University Bulletin,* February 1, 1969.

tion has been gleaned from a number of relevant research projects underway at the Center. Because some selection must be made and the thesis of this article is that change produces factions, the focus of the findings presented here will be upon differences existing among students, faculty, and administrative groups on the campus.

STUDENTS

It has been five years since "student activism" became a household word, and most educators are familiar with the research descriptions of the leaders of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. But five years is a long time on the changing college campus, and we don't know how much the present militant leadership has in common with the earlier activists. Paul Heist (1965-1966), Center psychologist, has written about the strong intellectual and esthetic interests of the early Berkeley activists. Project directors William Watts and David Whittaker (1966) conducted extensive studies of 172 students arrested in the 1964 Free Speech demonstrations at Berkeley, and concluded that: the FSM activists were more likely than a cross-section of Berkeley students to be women, to come from homes in which the parents were highly educated, to be younger, less influenced by formal religion, and less rigid on a measure of rigidity-flexibility. Academically, the activists were neither superior nor inferior students; their grade point averages were typical of the Berkeley student population.

More recently, Whittaker and Watts (1968) administered the Adjective Check List* to a group of students arrested for picketing a Navy recruiting table in December 1966. When these students were compared with a cross-section of Berkeley students on the Adjective Check List, the following scales differentiated the political activists (largely SDS members) from the other students. Activists scored significantly higher on Autonomy (acting independently of others or of social values and expectations), Change (seeking novelty of experience and avoidance of routine), Exhibition (behaving in such a way as to elicit the immediate attention of others), Aggression (engaging in behavior which attacks or hurts others), Heterosexuality (seeking the company of and deriving emotional satisfactions from interactions with opposite-sexed peers). They scored lower on Order (placing special emphasis on neatness, organization, and planning in one's activities).

In studying students on three campuses of the University of California, Kathleen Mock asked students completing their freshman year in 1966 how they felt about the FSM demonstrators of 1964. She found that 5 percent of those surveyed were favorable and supportive of the Berkeley activists while 20 percent were opposed and critical. By the sophomore year, however, only 10 percent remained "very opposed," whereas the pro-FSM group tended to maintain their original favorable attitude. As might be expected, those in the pro-FSM group were similar to the demonstrators themselves when compared on a number of psychological scales. Not as predictable was the similarity of attitudes about campus policy shared by the anti-FSM students and those who were neutral regarding the FSM. Table I shows how closely the attitudes of the anti-FSM freshmen parallel those of the neutral group. It appears that recent movements to organize the "silent majority" would offer resistance to some of the issues favored by the minority of very liberal students. But liberals, neutrals, and conservatives come closer to agreement when the issue is student participation in educational policies which affect them directly. It is not surprising that an overwhelming percentage (92 percent) of the pro-FSM freshmen endorsed greater student involvement in campus policies (Table I, question 1). What may surprise some is that over half of the anti-FSM and neutral students expressed the same desire.

TABLE I

UCB freshmen who endorsed statements concerned with campus policy decisions, by FSM attitudes (in percentages)

STATEMENTS	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
1. Would be sympathetic, become actively involved, or contribute money to the cause of greater student involvement in setting campus policies.	58%	59%	92%
2. Agree that students should "participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of that sort."	32	35	68
3. Agree that "students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects."	44	50	65
4. Strongly agree that "a person who advocates unpopular actions or holds unpopular ideas, no matter how extreme, should be allowed to speak to students on the college campus."	14	22	78
5. Strongly disagree that "present members of the Communist Party should not be allowed to teach in colleges and universities."	5	8	51
6. Strongly disagree that "legislative committees should investigate the political beliefs of university faculty members."	15	20	76

The second and third items in Table I concerning academic policies also attracted a sizable proportion of students of all persuasions. It is altogether likely that the militants are not speaking for themselves alone when they press for a greater voice in academic affairs. But students are probably well aware that power to influence academic decisions may be much more difficult to achieve that their recently-won influence in the determination of nonacademic policy.

FACULTY

Student participation in academic decision-making will require some concessions from the faculty, and data from the Faculty Characteristics Study under the direction of Robert C. Wilson and Jerry G. Gaff show quite different faculty attitudes toward student voting privileges in nonacademic and academic areas. Only 9 percent of the 1069 faculty members in the research sample thought that students should have an equal vote with the faculty in formulating *academic* policies, and younger faculty were no more receptive to the idea than older faculty. When the issue was student participation in *social* affairs, however, faculty members were considerably more hospitable; 45 percent would accord students equal voting rights on committees, and an additional 21 percent would leave the students totally responsible for their own social regulations.

*Gough, H. G., and Heilbrun, A. B. Jr. *The adjective check list manual.* Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1965.

The Faculty Characteristics data, which are in the process of analysis, represent a rich source of data for understanding faculty attitudes toward some of the unrest on college campuses. Of particular interest at present are faculty attitudes toward some controversial incidents described in the questionnaire, which was mailed to approximately 1500 faculty members at six institutions of higher education including both public and private colleges and ranging in level from a junior college to a state university.

In an era of rapid social change, younger faculty might be expected to view campus events from a different perspective than older faculty. Table II shows the attitudes of faculty members under 30 years of age (107 cases or about 10 percent of the total sample), and those 55 years of age and older (117 cases).

The questionnaire gave four alternatives ranging from "definitely should not be permitted" to "definitely should be permitted." For present purposes, those who felt that sanctions should "definitely" or "probably" not be permitted are combined.

TABLE II

Responses of faculty who felt hypothetical incidents "definitely" or "probably" should *not* be permitted (in percentage)

INCIDENT	Faculty Age Under 30	55+
1. A biology teacher spoke out in his class in favor of premarital sexual relations.	30%	63%
2. The student government using student funds invited a well-known social activist to the campus to speak.	8	21
3. A group of students held an anti-draft protest meeting on campus and subsequently picketed the local selective service board.	20	45
4. An unmarried male and female student couple were found to be sharing the same apartment.	17	58
5. A faculty member organized a Black Power group which engaged in some disruptive activities in the local community.	51	80
6. A faculty member participated in a non-violent sit-in demonstration in the administration building.	30	63
7. The student newspaper carried a series of articles on the use of drugs describing in detail how to use them.	46	72
8. A faculty member conducted classified military research.	30	41

It is immediately apparent that younger faculty are more permissive in most of the situations described. At the same time, it is probably true that the attitudes of older faculty are more likely to influence major policy decisions within the institution. Although not shown in Table II, there was a general tendency for those 30 to 39 to agree with the younger group, and for those 40-54 to express attitudes more similar to those of the older group. It is a moot point, of course, as to whether these data mean that faculties will become more permissive, or that younger faculty members will become more conservative as they grow older. Whatever the trend for the future, the fact for the present is that faculty differ widely on rather crucial policy matters.

ADMINISTRATION

In another study, Center sociologist Terry Lunsford shows that administrators, at least, tend to think that the attitudes of faculty members change with the assumption of greater responsibility for governance. Seventy-seven percent of his sample of 526 top administrators agree with the statement, "When a faculty member becomes an administrator his job changes, and he usually acquires a more responsible viewpoint as he assumes more obligations for institutional governance."

Lunsford is completing a study of the roles and attitudes of the 10 to 12 top administrative officers in each of 69 of the largest and most prestigious universities in the United States.*

Students may be surprised to learn the "The Administration" does not always agree on rather basic concepts concerning university policies. Administrators, like students and faculty, differ among themselves on the principles and the procedures of education. Of particular interest are Lunsford's tabulations of answers to two questions which are very much in the limelight today. Table III shows that administrators, as a group, tend to think that there is never good reason for the open flouting of university rules. Sixty-two percent of them agree with the statement, "Open flouting of university rules is always wrong, not only technically but morally, since it encourages disrespect for university authorities and for the rule of law." A larger portion of academic vice-presidents, however, disagree with the statement than agree (50 percent versus 40 percent), while business officers tended to take a conservative position, with 77 percent feeling that the open flouting of rules is always wrong. Despite the administrative problems caused by shows of student power, administrators are suprisingly accepting of the occasional need for such displays in order to bring about changes. Sixty-three percent of them agree with the statement, "Recent campus protests have demonstrated that a show of 'student power' sometimes is necessary to persuade university officials that they should take student grievances seriously." Only 33 percent disagreed. Presidents, almost always in the direct line of fire, are the only group to divide almost half-and-half on the issue. But a large majority (72 percent) of the student affairs officers, who are also directly involved in any display of student power, appear quite understanding of the occasional need for student protests.

TABLE III

Responses of university administrators to two questions about campus protests (in percentages)

	% agree	% disagree
Open flouting of university rules is always wrong.		
Presidents	61	22
Academic vice-presidents	40	50
Letters and Science deans	47	39
Business/Engineering deans	67	23
Student Affairs officers	53	43
Business/Finance officers	77	19
Total	62	30
A show of "student power" sometimes is necessary.		
Presidents	46	46
Academic vice-presidents	67	31
Letters and Science deans	78	20
Business/Engineering deans	57	37
Student Affairs officers	72	21
Business/Finance officers	57	37
Total	63	33

While university administrators show considerable diversity of opinion on these questions related to reactions to the student protests, there is a high rate of agreement about the stance of

*For a preliminary report based on literature and interviews see Lunsford (1968) or page 5 of *The Research Reporter.*

the university as far as the larger community is concerned. For example, the preservation of faculty freedom of speech is a basic value of most academic men, and there appears to be a consistent rejection of any threat to academic freedom. Only the business and financial officers waver on the right of a faculty member to speak his mind—even if it should involve the university in controversy. With the exception of the business officers, less than one-fourth of the administrative groups defined in Table II agreed that, "Faculty members should not make public speeches on political issues when there is substantial danger that this will involve their university as an institution in controversy." But almost half (48 percent) of the men who handle the money agreed with the statement. The well-publicized issue of academic freedom appears well supported by both faculty (Table II) and administrators. Among the students, however, only the pro-FSM group reflects this value commitment (Table I).

Another question regarding the official position of the university on which there is high agreement among administrators is that of law-breaking. Eighty percent of the administrators agreed that, "Universities must explicitly take a stand against all law-breaking; any other stance implicitly encourages each individual to obey only those rules he happens to agree with."

INTERGROUP TENSIONS

Certainly one can conclude that campuses today are replete with groups of differing opinions. It is not possible to speak with any precision about what is upsetting "The Students" or how "The Faculty" view various campus issues. But an experienced observer can identify *patterns* of goverance in the university, and the Center's founder, T. R. McConnell, has been analyzing the new patterns of governance from administrative and faculty perspectives. McConnell and co-author Kenneth P. Mortimer (1969), maintain that power and influence have become widely dispersed and that academe's democratic ideal of government by consensus is so difficult to achieve that it is more nearly myth than reality. The authors hypothesize that what replaces the old collegium is faculty governance by oligarchy, wherein some faculty members serve on the committees while the vast majority pursue their scholarship, entering the political arena only in periods of "crisis, great tension, or provocative challenge."

To administrators, McConnell (1968) suggests that "the most important distinction an administrator needs to make is that between management and leadership." He agrees that governance by the shared authority of students, faculty, administration, and governing board is a viable concept, but feels that administrators must lead in the mobilization of human resources toward the attainment of goals which are widely understood and widely accepted by the campus community. Perhaps the diagnosis of the present educational malaise lies in McConnell's observation that, "The failure to chart a university's directions and to stay on course is to expose the institution to cancerous growth from within and to vagrant pressures from without."

In his study of institutional character in eight colleges and universities, Martin (1969) found little concern for charting institutional directions. Smaller colleges, however, were more involved with institutional goals than universities, and the faculties of innovative colleges were considerably more likely to report attention to institutional objectives during job negotiations than were the faculty of more conventional institutions. Seventy-three percent of the respondents in innovative colleges, but only 6 percent in the conventional institutions, reported that institutional objectives were discussed at length when they considered joining the faculty. For 40 percent of Martin's total faculty sample, the emphasis in hiring was clearly on the work of the department, whereas for 16 percent institutional goals were emphasized. Martin's data stand as vivid testimony to the lack of marked interest in educational purpose.

Analyzing some issues in the control of higher education, Henderson (1969) observes that, "Socio-psychological theory poses that hostility and conflict exist where there is a divergence of goals. With divergence, genuine communication lessens. In turn, the goals diverge further and the communication lessens still further. This creates a downward spiral of misunderstanding. To gain a solution requires reversing this spiral through communication aimed at securing greater unity in goals."

Although it seems incredible to suggest that apathy is now a problem on our campuses, it is obvious that there is a failure on the part of the broader academic community to chart the directions for the future of higher education. It is highly unlikely that those seriously interested in improving higher education wish to travel the path of those militants intent on destruction—and if not, it is time for concerned faculty, students, and administrators to unite in effective action and blaze their own trail for education reform.

K. Patricia Cross

REFERENCES*

*Heist, P. A. Intellect and commitment: The faces of discontent. In *Order and Freedom on the Campus.* Proceedings of a conference sponsored by Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1965.

*Heist, P. A. The dynamics of student discontent and protest. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, 1966. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California.

Henderson, A. D. Control in higher education: Trends and issues. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1969, 40(1), 1-11.

Lunsford, T. F. Authority and ideology in the administered university. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 1968, 11(5), 5-14.

Martin, W. B. Institutional character in colleges and universities: The interaction of ideology, organization, and innovation. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California. (In preparation)

McConnell, T. R. The function of leadership in academic institutions. *Educational Record,* 1968, 49(2), 145-153.

*Mock, K. R. The potential activist and his perception of the university. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1968. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California.

Mortimer, K., and McConnell, T. R. Faculty participation in university governance. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California. (In preparation)

Watts, W., and Whittaker, D. Free speech advocates at Berkeley. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 1966, 2(1), 41-62.

Whittaker, D., and Watts, W. Societal confrontation or withdrawal: Group personality contrasts of two extreme youth subcultures. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego, 1968.

Wilson, R. C., and Gaff, J. G. Faculty characteristics and attitudes toward students. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California. (In preparation)

*Reports with an asterisk are available from the Center. The others can be found in journals or are in preparation. Details about the availability of the latter will be announced in future issues of *The Research Reporter.*

Administrative Authority In The Large University

To a degree perhaps unparalleled in Western history, the large universities of the United States are governed internally by administrative officials. While this development is widely seen as both necessary and desirable, the authority of administrators has long been at issue on university campuses across the country (Cattell, 1913). For more than half a century, for example, the question of increasing faculty participation in university governance has recurred in the academic literature (West, 1906). Today, as student political activists question much about the large university, they openly challenge administrators' decisions, and with them the very basis of administrative authority. In some cases, university administrators have proved highly vulnerable to such challenges, and it is fair to ask why.

This article examines some feature of the situation faced by these new university "executives," in an attempt to understand some of the structural reasons for their vulnerability. The article is part of a larger study that focuses also on administrators' attempts to strengthen the bases of their authority, and on some of the consequences of these attempts for the conflicts that now rack many large campuses.*

BUREAUCRATIC AUTHORITY

Let us examine some of the conditions which have led to the current situation. Hierarchic, rule-based authority has long been insecure in the academic setting because of its competition with a complex interplay of professional consensual principles.

Much has been written about the conflict of "professional and bureaucratic" bases of authority in organizations that use high expertise. Universities are, in some ways, extreme cases of such "professionalized" organizations, since the acquisition and selective transmission of esoteric knowledge are the very essence of their mission. One consequence is that standards of scholarship and methods of instruction are the almost exclusive province of specialized academic disciplines, which expect and tolerate relatively few intrusions from administrative officials.

Interlaced with the esoteric qualities of specialized research are traditions of academic freedom, which tend to be especially strong in the major centers of research. These traditions cast a halo of uncertain scope over much of academic life. They provide an added reason for administrators to avoid trying to supervise research or teaching in any direct way—lest the detached perspective of the scholar be subordinated to official orthodoxy.

Faculty orientations to consensual government also influence university authority, and consensual forms constrain the acceptance of hierarchic, rule-based authority in administrators. The formal responsibility of faculties for curriculum, degree requirements, and standards of work is a collective one, held by the faculty as a whole and typically exercised through its elected senate and/or standing committees. Consensual, even explicitly political, processes are inescapably involved here. Genuine faculty participation in campuswide academic policy is sorely attenuated in the large universities (where faculties may number 1,500 or more), and much policy is being taken over by the separate academic departments. Still, collegiality survives in decision-making within departments. And, although the academic rank of the participants introduces a hierarchic element that is not without force, it is widely believed that the professional ideal of content-oriented discussion among formally equal professional colleagues is dominant in many departmental decisions.

These present-day practices and beliefs are enhanced by long-standing images of the university as a "community of scholars," a body of equals without managers or even permanent executives. Such "democratic" models, drawn (with some idealization) from the experience of prestigious European universities, had considerable force during the confrontations of presidents and faculties a half-century ago. They have not entirely lost their impact today.

"MIXT" JURISDICTIONS

One classic response to conflicts between specialties is a separation of powers and jurisdictions. As suggested, this device is firmly entrenched in the university setting, causing some observers to refer to its "unique dualism" of controls (Corson, 1960). But the problem of administrative authority is not solved thereby.

Despite their formal separation, "academic" and "nonacademic" spheres inescapably impinge upon one another, so that their borders and interrelations become blurred. Many years ago, President Eliot of Harvard made note of those "mixt questions," involving both "science" and "a right proportioning of expenditures" in the university's budget (Eliot, 1911). Samuel B. Gould, President of the State University of New York, has more recently pointed to this area—where budgets and institutional forms affect substantive programs—as the critical point of ambiguity and conflict between universities and government officials (Gould, 1966). His remarks might well have been applied to the relations between faculty members and administrators.

The problem is augmented by the absence of a clear technical separation between faculty and administration in the processes of governance. Academic senates and administrative hierarchies have their formal and separate existences on most major campuses, hence their symbolic separation also. But frequently there is no simple and understandable division of the specific responsibilities. A classic statement of this fact was provided by the *Byrne Report* on the University of California at Berkeley, an institution where both administration and faculty participation in governance are well-advanced:

*Conclusions reached here are based on (1) study of the literature on university administration, (2) direct observation of university "administrative councils" in several universities, and (3) structured interviews with a number of large-university administrators. A more complete report, based on questionnaire responses, is forthcoming. The present article is adapted from a longer piece in the *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1968, 11(5), 5-14.

> In some areas the [Academic] Senate is a legislative body making basic policy, which the administration then carries out. In other areas, the administration makes basic policy, and the responsibility for implementing it is left to faculty committees, either appointed by the administration, with the advice of the Senate, or appointed by the Senate itself. In still other areas, the administration makes policy and also attends to the problems of implementing it.

THE UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

Attempts to separate "administrative" and "academic" spheres of control also bring other problems. As his tasks become more specialized, the university executive must face the question of his own expertise in his own specialty. He can legitimately claim information and experience that his faculty colleagues do not share about the typical problems and specific exigencies of institutional management. And this is important for his authority in faculty eyes, because competence in one's job is what the faculty specialist honors above most other things.

But the special competence of the academic administrator is highly precarious and contingent. In the first place, there is no esoteric specialty of "higher education" as an activity that academic men generally will acknowledge today, and in which university administrators might claim a trained and systematic competence akin to that of an academic discipline. Second, no expertise in governance (or administration, or management) is accepted by most academic men as a specialty that might undergird the special functions that administrators have come to perform. Thus, university specialists in administration today cannot convincingly claim, as a group, any distinctive expertise which might clothe their bare, formal positions with professional legitimacy. In the highly professionalized organization that is a university, this alone means that their authority itself is always more or less precarious.

These facts lend credence to a recurrent faculty view (lately adopted by students) that administrators in a university properly should not "manage" at all, but should simply act as "caretakers"—charged to provide the conditions that academics need for their work, but which they do not wish to spend time maintaining.

These dimensions of the faculty orientation to formal authority have not changed dramatically over the years. But major changes in the social context of university administration have recently intensified the difficulties of the university executive.

The rapid growth of student enrollments and faculty research contracts has brought in its train a vast expansion of the numbers of university faculty members and university administrators. Large numbers of persons are now involved in each of the two specialized types of tasks and positions. And, while the ratio of administrators to faculty members has not changed appreciably on most large campuses, the very numbers of administrators have made them much more visible.

Moreover, universities themselves are so highly visible today, so much more costly than before, and so dependent on state and Federal funds, that they are coming under ever-closer scrutiny by government officials. This means greater pressures to justify drains on the public purse—to "cut the fat" out of campus budgets, to set formulas for state appropriations, to require that faculty members carefully allot their time among projects differently funded, to emphasize efficiency through cost-benefit analyses of university programs. Where once academic bookkeeping approached a happy chaos, today it begins to approach a business model.

Administrators become the conduits of these newly felt demands to the academic practitioner, and must search for ways to transmit them in a form appropriate to the flexible and informal traditions of academic work.

These changes have helped to advance the division of labor within the administration, and to sharpen the separation between administrative and academic tasks on the large campus. Faculty members tend more to be concerned with, and effectively control, the university's directly goal-oriented activities: teaching, research, and professional consultation. More and more administrators find themselves excluded from such work. "Academic" vice-presidents, provosts, and even the deans of large campus units, although customarily recruited from the academic ranks, often find that they must give up trying to teach or to remain current in their academic specialties, and must devote their energies exclusively to the problems of institutional support and coordination. Other administrators lack faculty experience, and bear "nonacademic" responsibilities entirely. An increasing number of university executives spend most of their time coordinating the work of other administrators, and have little official reason for direct contact either with faculty members or students.

These forces have produced two related developments that are critical for university authority. One is the emergence of new patterns of association, and hence new group perspectives, within and between university campuses. The other is a symbolic separation of "the Administration" from the rest of the university.

DIVERGING WORLDS

University executives and faculty members are increasingly isolated from each other in their daily lives, while each is encouraged toward contacts mainly with "his own kind." The administrator, especially a high-level executive of a prestigious and fast-growing institution, is a chronically busy man. The sheer volume of the demands upon him, and the number of faculty members on his campus, make it effectively impossible for a vice-president or executive dean to meet regularly with any signifiant portion of the institution's faculty, or to get to know many of them personally. Often, an administrator's duties require him to make official judgments about competing faculty interests, and he can no longer expect the free and collegial interaction he may have enjoyed with his colleagues when he was primarily a faculty member. As O. Meredith Wilson (1965) has put it:

> . . . [He] must cut the bridges between him and the scholarly community when he accepts the new post. . . . He no longer can sit with them in judgment to determine the fate of students; he will now sit in judgment on them.

As a consequence, association with his fellow administrators is not only necessary because of impinging work-problems; many times it also is more comfortable.

On many large campuses, a dozen or so high-level administrators meet regularly in an "administrative council" to share perspectives on specific problems of university management. Not infrequently, personal ties are formed from these associations, and these may be explicitly encouraged to help create a working "team," referred to by its members as "the Central Administration."

High-ranking university executives may also find themselves "marginal men," destined to associate frequently with university trustees, state legislators, alumni delegates, Federal bureaucrats, and other community leaders. Some accommodation to these groups' ways of thinking becomes almost inevitable. Indeed, university administrators typically find that they share with these groups common concerns for institutional responsibility that are frequently far less salient among their faculty colleagues. Honest conviction thus helps to solidify the contacts begun in ritual courtesy and institutional ceremony. For some administrators, the respect accorded them when they meet the outside world as spokesmen of the university contrasts pleasurably with the lower prestige of administrators inside academe. These contacts therefore add their bit to shaping the administrator's perspective on university life.

Increasingly, also, university officials meet their opposite numbers in other institutions away from their campuses, at meetings of the many regional and national boards, commissions, advisory councils, inter-university groups, and "professional" associations of administrative specialties.

Literally scores of voluntary groups are peopled principally by campus administrators. Their meetings are at once Rotary conventions and "scholarly" conferences for the participants. Some of the administrative specialty groups work in these sessions to develop professional identities, and foster sharing of expertise or viewpoints on problems typically met by their members. At other meetings, deans or presidents "represent" their universities, and the focus is more general. Here one hears speeches on "educational policy" problems, business-like discussions of relations with the Federal government, and more or less rueful jokes about the problems of being "hated by everyone" back home. At both types of meetings, corridor talk and after-meeting conversations usually turn to the "politics" of campus, inter-campus, or support-source relations, and to the characteristic persistent dilemmas faced by the administrative groups to which the speakers belong.

Through such interaction, confidences are exchanged and perspectives compared. The participants come to realize (often with some relief) that others face problems similar to their own, and that they, too, have haltingly approached similar "solutions." Thus the range of alternative administrative actions and postures is defined, and shaped for future reference. Group processes and identities are established and later maintained by long-distance phone calls, jet trips, and correspondence.

SYMBOLIC SEPARATENESS

The specialization of tasks, the restriction of associations, the visibility of executive status, the unwelcome burden of conveying accountability—all of these conspire to accentuate the separateness of "the Administration" as a distinct and even alien segment of the university. Significantly, this segment is peculiarly identifiable with a classic ill of bureaucracy: displacement of organizational goals by "the organization" itself. Thus it becomes easy for faculty members and students to blame "the Administration" for all bureaucratic excesses, such as "red tape" or the constraints due to general rules. In the minds of many academics, "the Administration" becomes prominently associated with growing outside pressures on the university. The symbolic gap dividing "the Administration" from the substance and authenticity of daily academic life is thereby widened, and this has its force in making the gap a real one.

A major effect of these changes has been to erode the informal relationships between administrators and faculty members, relationships which engendered and sustained the trust necessary for an easy exercise of administrative authority, and which muted the potential conflict between administrators and academics in the university of an earlier day. Radical shrinkage of informal contacts has also reduced the actual knowledge that administrators have of faculty and students—and *vice versa*. Developments such as these have helped to lay the foundation for much of the student-administration conflict on today's large university campuses.

REFERENCES

Cattell, J. M. *University control.* New York: The Science Press, 1913.

Corson, J. *Governance of colleges and universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960. Pp. 43-46.

Eliot, C. W. The university president in the American commonwealth. *Educational Review,* December, 1911, 443.

Gould, S. B. The university and state government: Fears and reality. In W. J. Minter (Ed.), *Campus and Capitol.* Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966. P. 6.

Wilson, M. O. Address presented at inauguration of Ivan Hinderaker as Chancellor of the University of California, Riverside, 1965. Mimeo text, p. 8.

West, A. F. The changing conception of the faculty in American universities. *AAUP Proceedings,* March, 1906.

Institute on Values and Conflict

The relationship between changing traditional values and the conflict between power groups in higher education is the focus of the 11th Annual College and University Self-Study Institute. Sponsored by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, the meetings will take place from July 7-10 at the University of California, Berkeley.

Addresses will be given by Henry David Aiken, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis University, keynote speaker of the conference; Governor of the State of Oregon, Tom McCall; T. R. McConnell, Professor of Higher Education and Center Research Educator; John D. Millett, Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents; Rosemary Parks, Vice-Chancellor of Student and Curricular Affairs of the University of California at Los Angeles; and Susie Schmidt, Editor of the Collegiate Press Service, Washington, D. C.

The program was planned for presidents of colleges and universities, members of their staff, department chaimen, faculty members, and representatives of student organizations.

Deadline for advance registration is June 20, 1969, and requests for enrollment should be addressed to John Minter, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, University East Campus, 30th Street, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

Center-NASPA Conference Scheduled

The Dean of Students—Campus Activist? is the title of a conference to be held in San Diego, California, June 18-21, under the cosponsorship of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The conference is designed to familiarize student personnel administrators in higher education with the results of research in their special areas of interest and concern, to assist them in applying Center research findings to the solution of specific problems on their campuses, and to provide them with the opportunity to meet and consult with other NASPA members and Center research specialists and project directors.

The theme of this year's conference will be developed in the following program: K. Patricia Cross, the Center's Coordinator of Development Activities, will speak on the role of the dean in promoting student development; Harold L. Hodgkinson, Research Educator at the Center, will report on interviews with some 900 administrators, faculty, and students about existing attitudes towards deans and methods for evolving new ones; and T. R. McConnell, Center Research Educator, will draw on his personal experience with campus governance and personnel to suggest a reformulation of the functions of a dean of students.

Each of the speeches will be followed by a relevant case study, selected to reveal the theoretical problems in their practical form. Subsequent discussions and analyses of the material will be led by various deans.

The final presentation on the agenda will be a delineation and examination of a long-term, major confrontation on a state college campus, using video tapes, newspaper accounts, a chronological narrative of events, and resource personnel.

Co-chairmen of the conference are Allan W. Rogers, Dean of Men at Indiana State University at Terre Haute, Harold L. Hodgkinson, Center Research Educator, and Thomas McLeod, Assistant Dean of Men at the University of Alabama. Address all inquiries to Thomas McLeod.

The Research Reporter

The Research Reporter is published quarterly by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

LELAND L. MEDSKER, *Director*

K. PATRICIA CROSS, *Editor*

WILSON SCHOOLEY, *Managing Editor*

FROM THE EDITOR

This issue of the *Research Reporter* is one of a series reporting on the activities of the Center. The *Reporter* is written primarily for those who are directly concerned with the practice of higher education. Our goal is to report the results of research and study in higher education, focusing upon the implications for educational practice. We shall attempt to keep you posted on the on-going studies, the completion of research projects, and the publications issued from the Center.

The *Research Reporter* will be sent without charge to those who ask to be placed on the mailing list. We welcome your comments and reactions.

GPO-977-112

7-5-69

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
1947 CENTER STREET
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

Nonprofit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
Berkeley, Calif.
Permit No. 1

ANITA MAGNUS ASSOC DIR
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HI ED
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNI
WASHINGTON D C 20006